

**Oroville Facilities Relicensing Program
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project No. 2100
Draft Summary of the Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting
December 7, 2004**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group (CRWG) meeting on December 7, 2004 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	CRWG August 2004 Update
Attachment 4	CRWG September 2004 Update
Attachment 5	CRWG November 2004 Update
Attachment 6	Preliminary Draft Historic Properties Management Plan

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the CRWG meeting, introductions were made by each participant, and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. The CRWG observed a moment of silence to honor collaborative participant Anita Bell who recently passed away.

Action Items – July 20, 2004 CRWG Meeting

A summary of the July 2004 CRWG meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of the action item from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #C71: Distribute August 2004 Update.

Status: DWR distributed the updates for activities during August, September, and October 2004 to the CRWG participants via mail. (Attachments 3, 4, and 5, respectively.) Additional copies were available at the meeting.

Update on Studies

Historic-Era Archaeological Evaluations

Mark Selverston, Sonoma State University (SSU), reported that the historic archaeology team is in the final stage of the immediate evaluation effort. He reminded the group that their goal was to evaluate 10 percent of the identified historic-era sites. He informed the group that they have identified approximately 803 sites, with more than 500 containing historic elements. He described the different site types by category: water systems

(large systems near Lime Saddle such as Hendricks Ditch), transportation systems (such as roads), settlement sites (Fisher Homestead, Goat Ranch), and mining-related sites (such as the Southern Cross Mine and McCabe Creek). He discussed water and mining claims that have been uncovered within the study area, dating to 1851, and a series of letters from a miner working at McCabe Creek in the 1850s. Some archaeological evidence may indicate even earlier occupation at one site.

One participant asked if they have a feel for whether the sites identified are truly representative, whether the sites examined appear to contain redundant or more unique information, and about the adequacy of their low impact (i.e., no excavation) approach to the evaluation. Mark replied that based on his early impressions, the sample of sites in the area is good, and indicated that transportation theme was the least represented category. He said that they have obtained good data on a wide range of site types subject to varying degrees of impact, and that the data can contribute to the Historic Properties Management Plan. Mark also stated that he feels generally confident that they can identify which sites have good data recovery potential based on the use of the low impact approach. In response to a question about evidence of looting, Mark noted that there is evidence of looting at some sites in the form of piles of artifacts, etc., and that information on this impact was documented at the time of the survey. Mark also noted that this impact is most commonly observed in the fluctuation zone and near areas of public access, but that some sites (e.g., the Nash Homestead) appear to be untouched since they were abandoned. Much of the evaluation work has recently been at McCabe Creek.

Prehistoric Archaeological Evaluations

Michael Delacorte, California State University, Sacramento (CSUS), provided the CRWG with an update on the prehistoric site evaluations. He noted that they have also looked at McCabe Creek because of the need to address the ongoing woody debris collection/disposal operation, and have encountered seven locations of prehistoric activity. He described the protocol used, which begins with a walkover in a grid, marking artifact and feature locations with pin flagging. Locations are examined utilizing a limited amount of collecting and subsurface testing (1 meter x 0.5 meter shovel test units). Profiles were drawn, photographs taken, and finally, any disturbed soil was replaced. He noted that no analysis has been done at this point. He explained that they augered to a depth of at least 1.5 meters at one loci before getting to sterile soil and, while no analysis has been done at this point, the site is promising. Materials at the more complex locations show varied integrity, with some deposits appearing to be deeply disturbed, while others appear to be intact. He added that bone preservation is practically non-existent. However they are finding diagnostic projectile points and some obsidian (mostly pressure flakes) that would be suitable for hydration and sourcing. One participant asked where the materials they are collecting are being housed. Michael answered that the collected material is going to CSUS for cataloguing. Janis Offermann (DWR) mentioned that the collections would be housed in the project area when analysis is complete. Janis informed the CRWG that DWR is in the final stages of preparing and distributing the Archaeological Inventory Report.

Ethnographic Evaluations

Helen McCarthy, Far Western Anthropological Research Group (FWAR) informed the CRWG that she has been collaborating with the prehistoric archaeology team in order to determine possible matches of site locations with traditional cultural places. She added that to her knowledge, they do not yet have an ethnographic name for the McCabe Creek site.

Historic Properties Management Plan Development

Janis described the purpose of the Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) and distributed a preliminary draft HPMP (Attachment 6). She asked the CRWG to review the document and provide comments at or before the next CRWG meeting. Janis mentioned that the HPMP would be sent formally to the agencies and tribal governments for review and comment, and that comments will be handed out to the Maidu Advisory Council (MAC). She also mentioned that the draft text concerning dispute resolution would be revised following review by DWR's legal department. She mentioned that the HPMP is expected to be submitted with the application, but that it will not be in its final form. The consulting team and DWR will continue to develop the plan as sites are evaluated and data analyzed.

Steve Heipel (EDAW) reviewed the table of contents from the document with the CRWG. One participant asked if there would be a discussion of project-related actions on a per site basis included in the HPMP. Steve responded that some of that information is included but the current document is not complete in that regard because the findings are not yet comprehensive enough to use. He added that the purpose of this document is to take more of a planning approach that would be used as a tool to guide decisions regarding cultural resources within the project boundary for the term of the new license. He said that the near-term focus will be on areas where they know they have issues, such as McCabe Creek, but the HPMP is also focused on long-term management goals. He described the decision diagrams included in the draft and described the function that this document will provide in the future. Adrian Praetzelis of SSU suggested that this document would not just sit on the shelf because it provides a pragmatic approach for resource managers with clear steps to follow.

Janis invited the CRWG to write or email her with comments on the HPMP and she added that the CRWG would discuss comments to the document at the next meeting. She also announced that the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) would be filed with FERC in January 2005 as part of DWR's license application. One participant asked how settlement issues (e.g., analysis of previous collections, developing a sensitivity model for use by local governments) fit into the HPMP. Janis answered that while she believes everything in the draft settlement agreement is in the HPMP, there is no requirement that everything in the HPMP be included in the settlement. It was noted that the PDEA contains an assessment of all of the PM&E measures developed during the collaborative process, and that not all measures were found to have a nexus to the project.

Next Meeting and Next Steps

Janis suggested that the next CRWG should be the last regularly scheduled meeting for the group. The settlement group may request further consideration of something by the CRWG but otherwise, the January 18, 2005 CRWG meeting will be considered our final work group meeting. The location will be confirmed and an agenda distributed.

Action Item

Action Item #C72: Review the HPMP and provide comments at the January 18 CRWG meeting.

Responsible: CRWG

Due Date: January 18, 2005